

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Tron Manuel Littlejohn,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil Action No.: 1:10-cv-2332-TLW-SVH
)	
Jon Ozmint, Dennis Patterson,)	
Jimmy Sligh, Jr., Cecilia R. Reynolds,)	
Emilie Locklear, Helen McCray,)	
Daniel Debios, Craig Sumner, Annie)	
Mae Sellers, Jerome Armstrong,)	
Pamela Hough, Jerry Washington,)	
LuAnne Mungo, Darren Seward,)	
Jeanne McKay, Uleysses Buxton,)	
Anthony Dowling, and Bernadette)	
Jefferson,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

ORDER

On September 8, 2010, the plaintiff, Tron Manuel Littlejohn (“plaintiff”), proceeding pro se, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. #1). The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2), DSC.

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by the Magistrate Judge to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. # 67). On July 26, 2011, the Magistrate Judge issued the Report. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the defendants’ motion to dismiss (Doc. # 41) be granted and that this Court decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c) over any remaining state law

causes of action. (Doc. # 67). The plaintiff filed no objections to the Report. Objections were due on August 12, 2011.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. # 67). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the defendants' motion to dismiss (Doc. # 41) is **GRANTED**. To the extent the plaintiff's complaint contains state law causes of action, this Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over those claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). Due to this ruling, all other motions pending in this case at this time are now **MOOT**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

September 13, 2011
Florence, South Carolina